



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,028	04/08/2004	Takaya Matsuishi	251699US2	7569

22850 7590 09/08/2006

C. IRVIN MCCLELLAND
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/820,028	Applicant(s) MATSUISHI, TAKAYA	
	Examiner Matthew J. Ludwig	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☒ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/7/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed April 8, 2004. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.
2. Claims 1-25 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 14, 15, 23, and 25, are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In reference to claims 23 and 24, the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 23 and 24 are drawn to functional descriptive material NOT claimed as residing on a computer readable medium. MPEP 2106.IV.B.1(a).

In reference to claims 1-14, the claims are drawn to an apparatus that includes computer program software per se but fails to recite hardware necessary to carry out or perform the web page creation method. The apparatus claim must recite the hardware components necessary in carrying out the web page functions as stated within the independent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. **Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moshfeghi, U.S. Patent No. 6,476,833, issued November 2002.**

In reference to Independent claim 1, Moshfeghi teaches:

A method of controlling internet browser functionality and display according to user access and authorization levels (Abstract), in response to a client request, with database and browser interface which determines for each display section whether the information to be contained in the display satisfies the user's access permissions (compare to "*a request-related information items related to processing requests received from an external device which is connected with the web page creation through a network*"). See Col. 12, l. 49-Col. 13, l. 37, and Col. 13, l. 39-52.

Each section of the browser page contains a prescribed type of information, according to access rules (compare to "*a request-related information recording unit recording a request-related information item in the request-related information management unit in response to a processing unit*"). See column 8, lines 39-67.

Moshfeghi teaches that the browser display is updated in accordance with the determination result to create and focus on the relevant data (Col. 14, l. 15-50). Moshfeghi teaches the dynamic creation of a home page for restricted users based on authorizations in the user profile (Col. 14, l. 15-40). The page is created dynamically on request, therefore it automatically changes configuration if the profile satisfies the prescribed condition (compare to

Art Unit: 2178

“a Web page creation unit creating a Web page with which a user interface corresponding to the request-related information item concerned is displayed based on the request-related information item recorded in the...”). See column 14, lines 15-50.

In reference to dependent claim 2, Moshfeghi teaches:

Browser functionality determining whether the authorization conditions are satisfied. See column 12, lines 49-67 and column 13, lines 1-37.

In reference to dependent claim 3, Moshfeghi teaches:

The prescribed condition varies for each of the display sections. See column 13, lines 53-67 and column 14, lines 1-14.

In reference to dependent claim 4, Moshfeghi teaches:

A “crawler” program to update information contained in the display. The crawler program can periodically access each allowed URI address on the network to retrieve the document title. See column 14, lines 32-40.

In reference to dependent claim 5-8, Moshfeghi teaches:

Display sections are emphasized according to user profile records, i.e., by creating a browser sub-window including specific controls and markup language documents. See column 21-22, claim 1. Further it is inherent in Moshfeghi’s disclosure that the display data layout could be modified to expand a particular display section or to position it above other display sections, because Moshfeghi discloses that the display of controls and data can be resized, rearranged, temporarily hidden, overlapped, minimized, maximized, as windowing layouts well known in the art (Col. 12, l. 18-29).

In reference to dependent claim 9, Moshfeghi teaches an updatable homepage for restricted users where the configuration of each display section is managed dynamically (Col. 14, l. 15-55). Moshfeghi teaches a “crawler” program to update information contained in the display (Col. 14, l. 32-40).

In reference to dependent claims 10, Moshfeghi teaches:

The display configuration data of the display sections includes the information about the determination function. because each of the sub-windows are configured according to the directions in the user profile records (Col. 13, l. 21-35).

In reference to dependent claim 11-13, Moshfeghi teaches:

Other features of browsers are preferably enabled/disabled for different categories of users. These configurable features include support for markup language forms, tables, applets, frames, document printing. See column 11, lines 15-25.

In reference to dependent claim 14-25, the claims reflect similar limitations for carrying out a request-related information management system as those found in claims 1-13. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bidarahalli et al.,

USPN 6,990,574

filed (5/1/2001)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 571-272-4127. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ML



STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER